

## EPA Official Record

**Notes ID:** 9B88F44BC103090A882577420081FC68

**From:** Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US

**To:** John.Tindall@deq.idaho.gov

**Delivered Date:** 06/14/2010 04:41 PM PDT

**Subject:** Fw: Question about June 10th memo

John:

See the attached memo from LimnoTech, and subsequent discussion between Dave Dilks and myself (in the e-mail chain).

Thanks,

Brian Nickel, E.I.T.

Environmental Engineer

US EPA Region 10 | Office of Water and Watersheds | NPDES Permits Unit

Voice: 206-553-6251 | Toll Free: 800-424-4372 ext. 6251 | Fax: 206-553-0165

Nickel.Brian@epa.gov

<http://epa.gov/r10earth/waterpermits.htm>

Please conserve natural resources by not printing this message.



Alternate\_Idaho\_limits\_2\_061010.pdf

----- Forwarded by Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US on 06/14/2010 04:40 PM -----

**From:** "Dave Dilks" <ddilks@limno.com>

**To:** Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

**Cc:** Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Clark, Dave" <Dave.Clark@hdrinc.com>, <sidf@cdaid.org>

**Date:** 06/12/2010 06:26 AM

**Subject:** RE: Question about June 10th memo

Brian

I see the shading discrepancies you are referring to. I don't have the full calculation spreadsheet available right now to give you an exact answer but, working with the numbers in the memo, any discrepancy in calculations should be on the order of tens of thousandths of a mg/l. We'll certainly make sure that the exact numbers are in there before anything gets finalized, but the memorandum can reviewed with the expectation that the numbers in there will change very little.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov]

**Sent:** Friday, June 11, 2010 6:40 PM

**To:** Dave Dilks

**Cc:** Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov; Clark, Dave; sidf@cdaid.org

**Subject:** RE: Question about June 10th memo

Dave:

Thanks for the prompt reply. I have one more question. It appears that the shaded cells in the tables on Pages 4 and 5 (ostensibly those cells that were considered in the averaging) do not match the model segments and times where Avista has a DO responsibility (in other words, where and when the DO sag under the TMDL scenario is at least 0.2 mg/L) according to the final TMDL. For example, for July 1-15, your table has segments 174-188 shaded, whereas, according to the final TMDL, Avista only has a responsibility in segments 176-188, for that two-week period.

Could you please explain the discrepancy?

Thanks,

Brian Nickel, E.I.T.

Environmental Engineer

US EPA Region 10 | Office of Water and Watersheds | NPDES Permits Unit

Voice: 206-553-6251 | Toll Free: 800-424-4372 ext. 6251 | Fax:

206-553-0165

Nickel.Brian@epa.gov

<http://epa.gov/r10earth/waterpermits.htm>

Please conserve natural resources by not printing this message.

From: "Dave Dilks" <ddilks@limno.com>

To: Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: <sidf@cdaid.org>, Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Clark, Dave"

<Dave.Clark@hdrinc.com>

Date: 06/11/2010 02:34 PM

Subject: RE: Question about June 10th memo

Brian:

1. Model inputs were set up consistent with the TMDL.

2. The values in Table 2 are transposed, while the body of the text is correct. Table 2 should read:

Simulation	Incremental	Incremental
Impact on	Impact on	
Straight	Volume-Weighted	
Arithmetic	Average (mg/l)	
Average		
(mg/l)		
Original	0.0016	0.0035
Replication	-0.0057	-0.0066
n		

Let me know if you or Ben have additional questions.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 5:07 PM

To: Dave Dilks  
Cc: sidf@cdaid.org; Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Question about June 10th memo

Dave:

I just read your June 10th memo, and I've sent it to Ben Cope (who is out today). We may have more questions once Ben gets back.

Based on my initial read, I have two questions:

1. The memo refers to ammonia and CBOD5 "limits." Were the model inputs set equal to 71% of the "limits," or, equivalently, were the model inputs calculated by dividing the "limits" by 1.4, consistent with to the model runs supporting the TMDL?
2. The paragraph discussing the results (Page 2) says that "the alternative Idaho discharge scenario was predicted to increase (DO) by 0.0016 to 0.0035 mg/L for the original simulation. The replication showed a decrease in (DO) of 0.0057 to 0.0066 mg/L." These statements do not match Table 2, which shows that the original simulation showed a DO increase of 0.0016 mg/L using a straight arithmetic average, and a 0.0057 mg/L decrease using a volume-weighted average, and that the replication simulation showed a 0.0035 mg/L increase using a straight arithmetic average, and a decrease of 0.0066 mg/L using a volume-weighted average.

In other words, according to the table, the question of whether the alternative scenario results in an increase or a decrease in DO depends on how you average the results, whereas the narrative states that this depends on which simulation you're referring to (the original or the replication). Could you please clarify the results?

Thanks,

Brian Nickel, E.I.T.

Environmental Engineer  
US EPA Region 10 | Office of Water and Watersheds | NPDES Permits Unit  
Voice: 206-553-6251 | Toll Free: 800-424-4372 ext. 6251 | Fax:  
206-553-0165  
Nickel.Brian@epa.gov  
<http://epa.gov/r10earth/waterpermits.htm>  
Please conserve natural resources by not printing this message.